

Squeezing and entanglement in continuous variable systems

Yun-Jie Xia^{1,2*} and Guang-Can Guo^{1†}

¹*Key Laboratory of Quantum Information, University of Science and Technology of China, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Hefei, Anhui, China, 230026.*

²*Department of Physics, Qufu Normal University, Qufu, Shandong, China, 273165.*

Based on total variance of a pair of Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen (EPR) type operators, the generalized EPR entangled states in continuous variable systems are defined. We show that such entangled states must correspond with two-mode squeezing states whether these states are Gaussian or not and whether they are pure or not. With help of the relation between the total variance and the entanglement, the degree of such entanglement is also defined. Through analyzing some specific cases, we see that this method is very convenient and easy in practical application. In addition, an entangled state with no squeezing is studied, which reveals that there certainly exist something unknown about entanglement in continuous variable systems.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Ud, 03.67.Mn, 42.50.Dv

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum entanglement is the most significant and oddest trait in quantum mechanics and quantum information[1, 2]. Entanglement plays a crucial role in quantum information processing, such as quantum teleportation [3], entanglement swapping [4], dense coding [5], quantum cryptography [6] and quantum computation [7]. After the first experiments on quantum teleportation [8] and other quantum information processes using two-mode squeezing states [9, 10], continuous variable systems have aroused great interest in the separability properties. So far, most of theoretical and experimental work has focused on the entanglement properties of Gaussian states. For Gaussian states, the necessary and sufficient inseparability criterion had been fully developed[11, 12]. Recently, continuous-variable quantum teleportation through lossy channels[13], quantum homogenization with linear optical elements[14] and continuous-variable Werner state [15] for Gaussian states have been studied.

Generally speaking, it is difficult to determine whether a state is an entangled state. Although this problem has been solved in mathematics [16], it is not easy to make judgement for most of practical physics systems. In this paper, we consider the more generalized case that a state may not be necessarily a Gaussian state. Using the total variance of a pair of Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen type operators that is introduced by Duan et al. [11], we obtain the sufficient condition for entanglement in continuous variable systems. This kind of entangled states are regarded as generalized EPR entangled states (GEES). We also prove that a state must be two-mode squeezed state if the state is a GEES whether it is

Gaussian or not, and whether it is pure or not. From this result, the degree of entanglement [17] can be defined for such kind of entangled states and some examples are discussed in detail. It is clearly seen that the sufficient condition is very convenient and easy to judge whether a state is an entangled state.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we derive the sufficient condition for entanglement. In section III, we define the degree of entanglement. Some examples are discussed in detail in section IV, in which we prove that there exists an entangled state with no two-mode squeezing.

II. THE TOTAL VARIANCE OF EPR-LIKE OPERATORS AND ENTANGLEMENT

For two-particle continuous variable systems, the maximum entangled state may be expressed as a common eigenstate of EPR type operators[18]

$$\hat{X}_+ = \hat{x}_1 + \hat{x}_2 \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{P}_- = \hat{p}_1 - \hat{p}_2 \quad (2.1)$$

or another pair of operators

$$\hat{X}_- = \hat{x}_1 - \hat{x}_2 \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{P}_+ = \hat{p}_1 + \hat{p}_2 \quad (2.2)$$

where x_i and p_i ($i=1,2$) are the position and momentum operators for i -th particle. Following Ref.[11], we introduce the EPR-like operators

$$\hat{u} = |c|\hat{x}_1 + \frac{1}{c}\hat{x}_2 \quad (2.3)$$

$$\hat{v} = |c|\hat{p}_1 - \frac{1}{c}\hat{p}_2 \quad (2.4)$$

If $c = \pm 1$, above operators are reduced to the standard EPR type operators as expressed in (2.1) and (2.2).

In [11], it has been proved if a state is separable, then

*Electronic address: yjxia@qfnu.edu.cn

†Electronic address: gcguo@ustc.edu.cn

the total variance of EPR-like operators $\hat{u}$ and $\hat{v}$ will satisfy the inequality

$$\Delta\hat{u}^2 + \Delta\hat{v}^2 \geq c^2 + \frac{1}{c^2} \quad (2.5)$$

We let the position and momentum operators be rewritten in terms of a pair of boson operators $\hat{a}_i$ (annihilation operators) and $\hat{a}_i^\dagger$ (creation operators)

$$\hat{a}_i = \frac{\hat{x}_i + i\hat{p}_i}{\sqrt{2}} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{a}_i^\dagger = \frac{\hat{x}_i - i\hat{p}_i}{\sqrt{2}} \quad (2.6)$$

After some algebra, the total variance of EPR-like operators is expressed as

$$\Delta\hat{u}^2 + \Delta\hat{v}^2 = c^2 + \frac{1}{c^2} + 2\langle\hat{T}\rangle \quad (2.7)$$

where

$$\hat{T} = \left(\hat{Z}^\dagger - \langle\hat{Z}^\dagger\rangle\right) \left(\hat{Z} - \langle\hat{Z}\rangle\right) - \frac{1}{c^2} \quad (2.8)$$

and

$$\hat{Z} = |c|\hat{a}_1^\dagger + \frac{1}{c}\hat{a}_2 \quad (2.9)$$

It is well-known that displacement operation does not change the entanglement of a state. Without loss of generality, we can take $\bar{x}_i = \bar{p}_i = 0$ ($i = 1, 2$), then

$$\hat{T} = c^2\hat{a}_1^\dagger\hat{a}_1 + \frac{1}{c^2}\hat{a}_2^\dagger\hat{a}_2 + \frac{c}{|c|} \left(\hat{a}_1\hat{a}_2 + \hat{a}_1^\dagger\hat{a}_2^\dagger\right) \quad (2.10)$$

Clearly, the expected value of $\hat{T}$ in any separable state σ (density matrix) satisfies

$$\text{Tr}(\hat{T}\sigma) \geq 0 \quad (2.11)$$

According to inseparable theorem in [16], if

$$\text{Tr}(\hat{T}\rho) < 0 \quad (2.12)$$

for a given state ρ , then state ρ must be inseparable. So we can call $\hat{T}$ as a test operator. If operator $\hat{T}$ satisfies Eq. (2.12), the state of the two-particle continuous variable system is called "generalized EPR-entangled state" (GEES). If GEES exists in this system, it is easy to see that there must be two-mode squeezing. Combining Eq.(2.7) with (2.12) then we obtain

$$\Delta\hat{u}^2 < \frac{1}{2} \left(c^2 + \frac{1}{c^2}\right) \quad \text{or} \quad \Delta\hat{v}^2 < \frac{1}{2} \left(c^2 + \frac{1}{c^2}\right) \quad (2.13)$$

This is just the squeezing condition of EPR-like operators $\hat{u}$ and $\hat{v}$. So we conclude that there must be two-mode squeezing if GEES exists in this system.

It is noticeable that the parameter c is not arbitrary but dependent on the given state[11]. When we investigate the entanglement of a given state, we always hope

that the variance of EPR-like operator is as small as possible. From (2.10), the expected value of test operator $\hat{T}$ will reach the smallest under the condition

$$c^2 = \sqrt{\frac{n_2}{n_1}} \quad (2.14)$$

when the mean number $n_1(n_2)$ of photon for each mode is fixed. Obviously, constant c in EPR-like operators is determined by the mean number of photon. When the mean photon numbers of two modes is equal, it is allowed to let $c = \pm 1$. In practical application, we can first find c by the mean photon numbers $n_1(n_2)$ conveniently.

As to the sign of c , it depend on the expected value of operator $\hat{a}_1\hat{a}_2 + \hat{a}_1^\dagger\hat{a}_2^\dagger$

$$\delta = \langle\hat{a}_1\hat{a}_2 + \hat{a}_1^\dagger\hat{a}_2^\dagger\rangle \quad (2.15)$$

The sign of c is in opposition to that of δ .

From the above analysis we finally get the condition for GEES

$$|\delta| > 2\sqrt{n_1n_2} \quad (2.16)$$

It is obvious that this criterion is very simple and feasible in practical application.

Because the constant c may be positive or negative, the entanglement takes on two different types. One is near the common eigenstate of total position operator and relative momentum operator, the other is near the common eigenstate of total momentum operator and relative position operator.

In this section, we do not require that the related state is pure or mixed, and it is Gaussian or not. The entanglement condition (2.16) is held for any GEES.

Nevertheless, the squeezing of EPR-like operators is only the necessary condition for GEES. There must be some other type of entangled states in continuous variable systems. We will introduce an entangled state in which there is no squeezing in Sec. IV.

III. DEGREE OF ENTANGLEMENT

To find a well justified and mathematically tractable measure of entanglement is likely to be of value in number of areas of research, including the study of decoherence in quantum computers[19], and the evaluation of quantum cryptographic schemes[20]. About the degree of entanglement, the entanglement of formation is a creative idea. Wootters[17] first studied the analytical expression of entanglement of formation for two-qubit states. Later the entanglement of formation was also determined for highly symmetric states[21, 22]. In the above section, the total variance of EPR-like operator is certainly related to the entanglement. From (2.7), the total variance of EPR type operators is zero for the maximum entangled state. Given a state ρ , if we define the "concurrence" (Here we

borrow the concept introduced by Woottter[17]) as

$$\tau_\rho = \min \left[\frac{\Delta \hat{u}^2 + \Delta \hat{v}^2}{c^2 + 1/c^2}, 1 \right] \quad (3.1)$$

its value region is in $(0, 1]$. Now we can define the degree of entanglement as the following form

$$E(\tau_\rho) = h \left(\frac{1 + \sqrt{1 - \tau_\rho^2}}{2} \right) \quad (3.2)$$

$$h(x) = -x \log_2 x - (1 - x) \log_2 (1 - x)$$

The entanglement decreases along with increase of τ_ρ , so this function is a monotony convex in τ_ρ 's value region[17] and can be regarded as a measure of GEES. For example, the two-mode squeezed state[23]

$$|\psi\rangle = e^{r(\hat{a}_1^\dagger \hat{a}_2^\dagger - \hat{a}_1 \hat{a}_2)} |00\rangle \quad (3.3)$$

its "concurrence" is

$$\tau_\psi = e^{-2r} < 1 \quad (3.4)$$

which means that the two-mode squeezed pure state is always entangled.

IV. SOME EXAMPLES AND DISCUSSIONS

In this section, we will analyze in detail some examples about two-particle continuous variable systems. Of these examples, one is the standard EPR-type entangled state (such as Gaussian state with equal mean photon number and minimum-correlation mixed state), and the other is an entangled state but not EPR-like entanglement, in which there does not exist any squeezing. From these examples, it is seen that there are likely a lot more about entanglement to be studied in continuous variable systems.

A. Gaussian state with equal mean photon numbers

The Gaussian state with equal mean photon numbers for two modes is expressed by Q function

$$Q(\alpha, \beta) = (1 - x^2) K^2 \exp \left\{ -K [|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 + x(\alpha\beta + \alpha^*\beta^*)] \right\} \quad (4.1)$$

$$K = \frac{1}{(n+1)(1-x^2)}, n \geq 0, |x| < 1$$

where n is the mean number of photon per mode, and x is a correlation parameter. The inseparability of this state had been studied in Ref.[24] using Simon's criterion[12]. Now we will study it by (2.7). With help of integration

$$\int \frac{d^2 z}{\pi} e^{-\gamma|z|^2 + sz + tz^*} = \frac{1}{\gamma} e^{\frac{st}{\gamma}}, \quad \gamma > 0 \quad (4.2)$$

it is easy to obtain

$$\langle \hat{a}_1 \hat{a}_2 + \hat{a}_1^\dagger \hat{a}_2^\dagger \rangle = -2x(n+1) \quad (4.3)$$

Because the mean photon numbers for two mode are equal, the parameter $c = +1$ or -1 is dependent on the sign of correlation constant x . The expected value of test operator $\hat{T}$ is

$$\langle \hat{T} \rangle = 2n \mp 2x(n+1) \quad (4.4)$$

The entangled state corresponds to $\langle \hat{T} \rangle < 0$, which leads to

$$\frac{n}{n+1} < |x| \leq \sqrt{\frac{n}{n+1}} \quad (4.5)$$

This is agreement with Ref.[24] and show that this method is simpler and easier than Simon's criterion. The limit for x in the right side of above equation comes from the requirement that the Q function in (4.1) is not valid for all values of x [24].

B. The minimum-correlation mixed state

The minimum-correlation state[25] for the pair of operators $\hat{X}_+$ and $\hat{P}_+$ is expressed in the form[26]

$$Q(\alpha, \beta) = (1 - 2d) \exp \left\{ -(1 - d) \left[\gamma |\alpha|^2 + \frac{1}{\gamma} |\beta|^2 \right] \right\} \times \exp [-d(\alpha\beta + \alpha^*\beta^*)] \quad (4.6)$$

where $\gamma = \tanh(r)$ is the squeezing parameter. The requirement that Q function converge for large values of $|\alpha|$ and $|\beta|$ gives the condition $d \leq 1/2$.

The expected values of related operators are given by the expressions

$$n_1 = \frac{1 - d}{\gamma(1 - 2d)} - 1 \quad (4.7a)$$

$$n_2 = \frac{\gamma(1 - d)}{1 - 2d} - 1 \quad (4.7b)$$

$$\langle \hat{a}_1 \hat{a}_2 + \hat{a}_1^\dagger \hat{a}_2^\dagger \rangle = -\frac{2d}{1 - 2d} \quad (4.7c)$$

On substituting from Eq.(4.7) into Eq.(2.14) and Eq.(2.10), we obtain the expression

$$\langle \hat{T} \rangle = -[\tanh(r) + \coth(r) - 2] \frac{1 - d}{1 - 2d} \quad (4.8)$$

This expected value is negative for all $r > 0$, which means entanglement always exists in the state.

It is worth pointing out that the total variance of standard EPR-type operators does not satisfy the entanglement condition Eq.(2.12). In fact, one can derive the following result

$$\langle \hat{T} \rangle|_{c=1} = [\tanh(r) + \coth(r) - 2] \frac{1-d}{1-2d} \geq 0 \quad (4.9)$$

for $r > 0$. This result shows that there does not exist squeezing of standard EPR-type operators in the minimum correlation state. But the state certainly exhibits squeezing of EPR-like operators with $c^2 = \sqrt{n_2/n_1}$. So GEES corresponds with the squeezing of standard EPR-type operators only in some special case and the corresponding is held only when the mean photon number per mode are equal. It is very important to choose the constant c properly when we judge whether a state is an entangled state.

C. The entangled coherent states

The entangled coherent states[27] are other important continuous variable entangled states. Although the coherence is degraded when these states are embedded in the environment, its entanglement is not totally lost. Much possible application to quantum information processing has been studied utilizing entangled states[28]. The entangled coherent states can be defined as

$$|\psi^\pm\rangle = N_\pm(|\alpha_1\rangle|\alpha_2\rangle \pm |-\alpha_1\rangle|-\alpha_2\rangle) \quad (4.10)$$

where $|\alpha_i\rangle (i = 1, 2)$ is coherent state for i -th mode, $N_\pm = 1/\sqrt{2[1 \pm e^{-2(|\alpha_1|^2 + |\alpha_2|^2)}]}$ are the normalization constants. In the following discussion, without loss of generality, we let $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$. The above two states are certainly entangled states for two-mode fields. From the following results

$$\langle \psi^+ | \psi^- \rangle = 0 \quad (4.11a)$$

$$\hat{a}_1 \hat{a}_2 |\psi^\pm\rangle = \hat{a}_1^2 |\psi^\pm\rangle = \hat{a}_2^2 |\psi^\pm\rangle = \alpha^2 |\psi^\pm\rangle \quad (4.11b)$$

$$\langle \psi^\pm | \hat{a}_1 | \psi^\pm \rangle = \langle \psi^\pm | \hat{a}_2 | \psi^\pm \rangle = 0 \quad (4.11c)$$

$$n_1^\pm = n_2^\pm = |\alpha|^2 \frac{N_\pm^2}{N_\mp^2} \quad (4.11d)$$

one can obtain the expected values of the test operator

$$\langle \hat{T} \rangle_+ = 2R^2 [\tanh(2R^2) - |\cos 2\theta|] \quad (4.12)$$

$$\langle \hat{T} \rangle_- = 2R^2 [\coth(2R^2) - |\cos 2\theta|] \quad (4.13)$$

where $\alpha = Re^{i\theta}$. Because $\langle \hat{T} \rangle_-$ is always positive for any value of parameter α , $|\psi^- \rangle$ is not a GEES. $|\psi^+ \rangle$ is still a GEES if α is chosen properly.

It is easy to show that $|\psi^+ \rangle$ can exhibit squeezing of two-mode field under suitable condition. But there does not exist any squeezing of two-mode field amplitude in the state $|\psi^- \rangle$. Although GEES certainly leads to the squeezing of EPR-like operator, the squeezing exists only in GEES within our present knowledge. Other type of entangled states in this system, such as $|\psi^- \rangle$ and $|\psi^+ \rangle$ under some conditions, exhibit no squeezing. These kinds of entanglement have not been studied about their essence so far.

From the above discussion we can conclude that GEES is the only one kind of entanglement for two-particle continuous variable systems. Other types of the entanglement in this system, such as $|\psi^\pm \rangle$, are necessarily to be studied deeply. Whether this kind of entanglement corresponds with some nonclassical effects of two-mode fields and the entanglement degree of such entangled states are all worthy of studying later. It is reasonable to believe that there is much more to be studied for this system although we noticed that some progress about the entanglement measure for continuous variable system has been made[29, 30].

Acknowledgments

We thank Lu-Ming Duan and Zheng-Wei Zhou for helpful discussions. This work was supported by the National Fundamental Research Program (2001CB309300), National Natural Science Foundation of China, and the Innovation funds from the Chinese Academy of Sciences.

-
- [1] E. Schrödinger, *Naturwissenschaften* **23**, 807; 823; 844(1935).
 - [2] C. H. Bennett, *Phys. Today* **48**, No.10, 24(1995).
 - [3] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crepeau, R. Jozsa, A. Peres and W. K. Wootters, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**, 1895(1993).
 - [4] M. Zukowshi, A. Zeilinger, M. A. Horne, and A. K. Ekert, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **71**, 4287(1993); J.-W. Pan, D. Bouwmeester, H. Weinfurter and A. Zeilinger, *ibid.* **80**, 3891(1998).

- [5] C. H. Bennett and S. J. Wiesner, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **69**, 2881(1992).
- [6] A. K. Ekert, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **67**, 661(1991).
- [7] A. Barenco, D. Deutsch, A. Ekert, and R. Jozsa, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **74**, 4083(1989).
- [8] A. Furusawa, J. L. Sorensen, S. L. Braunstein, C. A. Fuchs, H.J. Kimble, and E. S. Polzik, *Science* **282**, 706(1998).
- [9] L. Vaidman, *Phys. Rev. A* **49**, 1473(1994).
- [10] S. L. Braunstein, and H. J. Kimble, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**,

- 869(1998).
- [11] Lu-Ming Duan, G. Giedke, J. I. Cirac, and P. Zoller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 2722(2000).
 - [12] R. Simon, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 2726(2000).
 - [13] A. V. Chizhow, L. Knöll, and D.-G. Welsch, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 22310(2002).
 - [14] D. Nagař, P. Stelmachovic, V. Buzek, and M. Kim, Phys. Rev. A **66**, 62307(2002).
 - [15] L. Mista, Jr. R. Filip, and J. Fiurasek, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 62315(2002).
 - [16] M. Hordecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Hordecki, Phys. Lett. A **223**, 1(1996).
 - [17] W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. A **54**, 3824(1996).
 - [18] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky, and R. Rosen, Phys. Rev. A **54**, 3824(1996).
 - [19] See, for example, D. P. DiVincenzo, Science **270**, 255(1995).
 - [20] C. A. Fuchs, N. Gisin, R. B. Griffiths, C.-S. Niu, and A. Peres, Phys. Rev. A **56**, 1163(1997), and references therein.
 - [21] B. M. Terhal and K. G. H. Vollbrecht, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 2625(2000).
 - [22] K. G. H. Vollbrecht and R. F. Werner, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 62307(2001).
 - [23] D. F. Walls and G. J. Milburn, Quantum Optics (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1994).
 - [24] E. Santos, Eur. Phys. J. D**22**, 423(2003).
 - [25] S. A. Ponomaredko, and E. Wolf, Phys. Rev. A **63**, 62106(2001).
 - [26] G. S. Agarwal, and S. A. Ponomaredko, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 32103(2003).
 - [27] B. C. Sanders, Phys. Rev. A**45**, 6811(1992); J. C. Howell, and J. A. Yeazell, *ibid* **62**, 12102(2000).
 - [28] J. Jeong, W. Son, M. S. Kim, D. Ahn, and Č. Brukner, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 12016(2003); S. J. van Enk and O. Hirota, *ibid* **64**, 22314(2001); J. Jeong, M. S. Kim, and J. Lee, *ibid* **64**, 52308(2001); X. Wang, *ibid* **64**, 22302(2001); W. J. Munro, G. J. Milburn, and B. C. Sanders, *ibid* **62**, 52108(2000); J. Clausen, L. Knöll, and D.-G. Welsch, e-print quant-ph/0203144.
 - [29] S. Parker, S. Bose, and M. B. Plenio, Phys. Rev. A **61**, 32350(2000).
 - [30] H. X. Lu, Z. B. Chen, J. W. Pan, and Y. D. Zhang, quant-ph/0204098.